



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,796	05/18/2006	Akira Osada	290100US2PCT	3471

22850 7590 04/21/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SCHINDLER, DAVID M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2862

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/21/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/579,796	Applicant(s) OSADA ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID M. SCHINDLER	Art Unit 2862	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/5/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed 1/9/2008. Upon further consideration, the previously indicated claim allowability is withdrawn in view of the rejections found below.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. It is however noted the applicant states that claims 11 and 12 were not previously examined. It appears applicant means claims 12 and 13. These claims are included in this office action.

4. Applicant is advised that should claims 3 and 4 be found allowable, claims 12 and 13 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Art Unit: 2862

Claim Objections

5. Claims 3, 4, 12, and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "all of the rest signals" in the last line of claims 3 and 12, the second to last line of claims 4 and 13 is awkward. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2862

Claims 1, 5-8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirama et al. (Hirama) (4,427,940) in view of Lund (US 5,864,229).

8. As to Claim 1,

9. Hirama discloses a plurality of flaw detectors disposed near the wire rope ((Figure 7A) and (Column 5, Lines 50-68) and (Column 6, Lines 1-16)), each of the flaw detectors has a first and a second magnetic pole of different polarity ((Figures 2 and 3) and (Column 2, Lines 56-68)), and a magnetic sensor of a U-shape disposed between the first and second magnetic poles ((Figures 2 and 3) and (Column 3, Lines 9-55)).

10. Hirama does not disclose each of the U-shaped magnetic sensors has a bottom radius in the range of 2mm to 5mm, a difference between the bottom radius of the magnetic sensor and a half of the nominal diameter of the wire rope being equal to or less than 1.5 mm, and a distance between the sidewalls of the U-shaped magnetic sensors of the adjacent flaw detectors in plan view is equal to or more than 2mm.

11. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the relative dimensions of Hirama to include the feature of each of the U-shaped magnetic sensors has a bottom radius in the range of 2mm to 5mm, and the feature of a distance between the sidewalls of

Art Unit: 2862

the U-shaped magnetic sensors of the adjacent flaw detectors in plan view is equal to or more than 2mm because it has been held that where the only difference between the prior art and the claims was a recitation of relative dimensions of the claimed device and a device having the claimed relative dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device was not patentably distinct from the prior art device. See MPEP 2144.04 and In Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984).

12. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify to optimize the range of values for the distance between the bottom radius of the magnetic sensor and the nominal diameter of the wire rope to include a difference between the bottom radius of the magnetic sensor and a half of the nominal diameter of the wire rope being equal to or less than 1.5 mm as it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (MPEP 2144.05).

13. HIRAMA does not disclose the adjacent flaw detectors are staggered relative to a longitudinal direction of the wire rope.

Art Unit: 2862

14. Lund discloses the adjacent flaw detectors are staggered relative to a longitudinal direction (Figure 31 / note (40a)-(41d)).

15. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Hirama to include the adjacent flaw detectors are staggered relative to a longitudinal direction of the wire rope given the above disclosure and teaching of Lund in order to provide continuous detector over a larger area of the rope.

16. As to Claim 5,

17. Hirama discloses securing members for holding and securing the respective flaw detectors on predetermined positions of an elevator shaft or machineroom ((Figure 1) and (Column 2, Lines 42-55)).

18. As to Claim 6,

19. Hirama discloses the securing members for holding the flaw detectors are disposed near a hoist (Figure 1).

20. As to Claim 7,

21. Hirama discloses the securing members hold the flaw detectors at positions where a side surface of the wire rope which is in contact with a groove of a driving sheave of the hoist and bottom surfaces of the magnetic sensors of the flaw

Art Unit: 2862

detectors are opposed to each to other ((Figures 1, 2, 3, and 7) and (Column 3, Lines 9-55)).

22. As to Claim 8,

23. Hirama does not disclose securing members for hold and securing the flaw detectors on an elevator car. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to rearrange the location of the detectors to include securing members for hold and securing the flaw detectors on an elevator car in order to position the detectors at a desired location (MPEP 2144.04).

24. As to Claim 11,

25. Hirama discloses each of the U-shaped magnetic sensors covers at least a semi-circumference or more of the wire rope (Figure 3).

26. Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirama et al. (Hirama) (4,427,940) and Lund (US 5,864,229) in view of Yamashita (6,756,759).

27. As to Claim 3,

28. Hirama in view of Lund does not disclose a filter for filtering to eliminate noises other than signals showing a flaw of the wire rope from signals that are output from the magnetic

Art Unit: 2862

sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors, wherein after filtering the noises, all of the rest signals are summed up.

29. Yamashita discloses filtering a signal and then providing it to an adder.

30. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Hirama in view of Lund to include a filter for filtering to eliminate noises other than signals showing a flaw of the wire rope from signals that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors, wherein after filtering the noises, all of the rest signals are summed up given the above disclosure and teaching of Yamashita in order to remove unwanted signals from the detector outputs.

31. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirama et al. (Hirama) (4,427,940) in view of Lund (US 5,864,229) as applied to claim 1 and in further view of Marchent (GB 2012966 A).

32. Hirama in view of Lund does not disclose a means for eliminating signals under a threshold value from signals that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors, wherein after eliminating the signals under the threshold value, all the rest of the signals are summed up.

Art Unit: 2862

33. Marchent discloses a means for eliminating signals under a threshold value from signals that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors (note elimination of noise), wherein after eliminating the signals under the threshold value, all the rest of the signals are summed up ((Figures 8-10) and (Page 3, Lines 5-93)).

34. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Hirama in view of Lund to include a means for eliminating signals under a threshold value from signals that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors, wherein after eliminating the signals under the threshold value, all the rest of the signals are summed up as taught by Marchent in order to provide a signal with reduced noise and in which can be compared for the purposes of detecting a broken wire.

35. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirama et al. (Hirama) (4,427,940) and Lund (US 5,864,229) in view of Hickman (5,828,213).

36. As to Claim 9,

37. Hirama in view of Lund does not disclose means for converting analogue signals, that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors, to digital signals and storing the digital signals.

Art Unit: 2862

38. Hickman discloses means for converting analogue signals, that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors, to digital signals and storing the digital signals ((Abstract) and (Figure 12)).

39. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Hirama to include means for converting analogue signals, that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors, to digital signals and storing the digital signals as taught by Hickman in order to be able to provide the signals to a digital computer for future retrieval.

40. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirama et al. (Hirama) (4,427,940) and Lund (US 5,864,229) in view of Hamelin et al. (Hamelin) (5,804,964).

41. Hirama in view of Lund does not disclose a device for displaying a sum of signals that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors.

42. Hamelin discloses a device for displaying a sum of signals that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors (Abstract).

43. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Hirama in view of

Art Unit: 2862

Lund to include a device for displaying a sum of signals that are output from the magnetic sensors of the plurality of flaw detectors as taught by Hamelin in order to make the information readily available to a user (Abstract).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID M. SCHINDLER whose telephone number is (571)272-2112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00AM-5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Assouad can be reached on (571) 272-2210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2862

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David M. Schindler
Examiner
Art Unit 2862

DMS

/Patrick J Assouad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2862